



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/629,459	07/29/2003	Guogen Zhang	SVL920030024US1	7326
22462	7590	01/28/2008	EXAMINER	
GATES & COOPER LLP HOWARD HUGHES CENTER 6701 CENTER DRIVE WEST, SUITE 1050 LOS ANGELES, CA 90045			ADAMS, CHARLES D	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2164				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/28/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/629,459	ZHANG ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Charles D. Adams	2164

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 October 2007.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Remarks***

1. In response to communications filed on 25 October 2007, claims 1, 4, and 7 are amended. Claims 1-9 are pending in the application.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3. Claims 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because, though an apparatus is claimed, the specification provides evidence that the "computer system" may simply be software modules (see 5:15-6:3 of the current application). The server and hardware components are claimed. As such, the claims lack the necessary physical articles or objects to constitute a machine or a manufacture within the meaning of 35 USC 101. They are clearly not a series of steps or acts to be a process nor are they a combination of chemical compounds to be a composition of matter. As such, they fail to fall within a statutory category. They are, at best, functional descriptive material *per se*.

Descriptive material can be characterized as either "functional descriptive material" or "nonfunctional descriptive material." Both types of "descriptive material" are nonstatutory when claimed as descriptive material *per se*, 33 F.3d at 1360, 31 USPQ2d at 1759. When functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium, it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be

statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized. Compare *In re Lawry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d 1031, 1035 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Merely claiming nonfunctional descriptive material, i.e., abstract ideas, stored on a computer-readable medium, in a computer, or on an electromagnetic carrier signal, does not make it statutory. See *Diehr*, 450 U.S. at 185-186, 209 USPQ at 8 (noting that the claims for an algorithm in *Benson* were unpatentable as abstract ideas because “[t]he sole practical application of the algorithm was in connection with the programming of a general purpose computer.”).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng et al. (“Implementation of Two Semantic Query Optimization Techniques in DB2 Universal Database”), in view of Cochrane et al. (US Patent 5,963,936), and further in view of Al-omari et al. (US Patent 6,438,741).

As to claim 1, Cheng et al. teaches a method of optimizing a query in a computer system, the query being performed by the computer system to retrieve data from a database stored on the computer system (see Abstract), the method comprising:

(a) during compilation of the query, maintaining a GROUP BY clause (see Cheng et al. Page 1, Example 1, and Page 5, query 1)

Cheng et al. does not teach with one or more GROUPING SETS, ROLLUP or CUBE operations

Cochrane et al. teaches with one or more GROUPING SETS, ROLLUP or CUBE operations (see column 7, lines 26-30, and column 7, lines 44-48)

Cheng et al. as modified teaches in its original form, instead of rewriting the GROUP BY clause, until after query rewrite (see Cheng et al. Page 1, Example 1, and Page 5, query 1. In Q'1, the group by clause has been retained); and

(b) at a later stage of query compilation, translating the GROUP BY clause with the GROUPING SETS, ROLLUP, or CUBE operations into a plurality of levels, wherein each of the levels has one or more grouping sets (see Cochrane et al. 8:26-42, Figure 7. This step occurs after the step listed above) comprised of grouping columns (see 11:62-12:15. The GROUP BY sets are comprised of columns a, b, x, and y),

Cheng et al. does not teach generating a query execution plan for the query with a super group block having an array of grouping sets, wherein each pointer points to the grouping sets for a particular one of the levels.

Al-omari et al. teaches generating a query execution plan for the query with a super group block having an array of grouping sets, wherein each pointer points to the

grouping sets for a particular one of the levels (see Figure 3D, 'link mode to GROUP').

Also see 10:36-48, 14:28-35, 41-43)

Cheng et al. as modified teaches:

(c) performing the query execution plan to retrieve data from a database stored on the computer system (see Cochrane et al. 7:41-43).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Cheng et al. by the teachings of Cochrane et al., since Cochrane et al. teaches that "a method for detecting and stacking grouping sets to support group by operations with grouping sets, rollup, and cube extensions in relational database management systems, with greatly reduced numbers of grouping sets" (see Abstract).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Cheng et al. by the teachings of Al-omari et al., since Al-omari et al. teaches "a system and method for optimizing complex SQL database queries" (see 3:18-19).

As to claim 2, Cheng et al. as modified teaches further comprising:

(1) at query execution time, dynamically determining a grouping sequence for the GROUP BY clause with the GROUPING SETS, ROLLUP or CUBE operations based on intermediate grouping sets, in order to optimize the grouping sets sequence (see Cochrane et al. 8:26-42, Figure 7).

As to claim 3, Cheng et al. as modified teaches wherein the dynamically determining step further comprises (1) performing a GROUP BY for a base grouping set and then optimizing execution of the grouping sets sequence by selecting a grouping set having lowest cardinality from a previous one of the levels as an input to a grouping set on a next one of the levels (see Cochrane et al. 11:43-47. The GROUP BYs “are stacked from greatest to least cardinality”. There is only one grouping set per level. It is inherent, then, that the chosen grouping set sequence from a previous one of the levels will be the smallest one on its level), and (2) performing a UNION ALL operation on the grouping sets (see Cochrane et al. 11:47-49 and Figure 7. “The base group by and all the GROUP BYs for ROLLUP1 are unioned together. If all of the GROUP BYs are unioned together, then it is functionally equivalent to a UNION ALL”).

As to claim 4, Cheng et al. teaches a computer-implemented apparatus for optimizing a query, the query being performed to retrieve data from a database, the apparatus comprising:

- (a) a computer system;
- (b) logic, performed by the computer system, for
  - (1) during compilation of the query, maintaining a GROUP BY clause (see Cheng et al. Page 1, Example 1, and Page 5, query 1)

Cheng et al. does not teach with one or more GROUPING SETS, ROLLUP or CUBE operations

Cochrane et al. teaches with one or more GROUPING SETS, ROLLUP or CUBE operations (see column 7, lines 26-30, and column 7, lines 44-48)

Cheng et al. as modified teaches in its original form, instead of rewriting the GROUP BY clause, until after query rewrite (see Cheng et al. Page 1, Example 1, and Page 5, query 1. In Q'1, the group by clause has been retained); and

(2) at a later stage of query compilation, translating the GROUP BY clause with the GROUPING SETS, ROLLUP, or CUBE operations into a plurality of levels, wherein each of the levels has one or more grouping sets (see Cochrane et al. 8:26-42, Figure 7. This step occurs after the step listed above) comprised of grouping columns (see Cochrane et al. 11:62-12:15. The GROUP BY sets are comprised of columns a, b, x, and y),

Cheng et al. as modified does not teach generating a query execution plan for the query with a super group block having an array of pointers, wherein each pointer points to the grouping sets for a particular one of the levels.

Al-omari et al. teaches generating a query execution plan for the query with a super group block having an array of pointers, wherein each pointer points to the grouping sets for a particular one of the levels (see Figure 3D, 'link mode to GROUP'. Also see 10:36-48, 14:28-35, 41-43)

Cheng et al. as modified teaches:

(3) performing the query execution plan to retrieve data from a database stored on the computer system (see Cochrane et al. 7:41-43).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Cheng et al. by the teachings of Cochrane et al., since Cochrane et al. teaches that "a method for detecting and stacking grouping sets to support group by operations with grouping sets, rollup, and cube extensions in relational database management systems, with greatly reduced numbers of grouping sets" (see Abstract).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Cheng et al. by the teachings of Al-omari et al., since Al-omari et al. teaches "a system and method for optimizing complex SQL database queries" (see 3:18-19).

As to claim 5, see the argument in regards to claim 2 above.

As to claim 6, see the argument in regards to claim 3 above.

As to claim 7, Cheng et al. teaches an article of manufacture comprising a program storage device embodying instructions that, when read and executed by a computer system, cause the computer system to perform a method for optimizing a query, the query being performed by the computer system to retrieve data from a database stored in a data storage device coupled to the computer system (see Abstract), the method comprising:

(a) during compilation of the query, maintaining a GROUP BY clause

Cheng et al. does not teach with one or more GROUPING SETS, ROLLUP or CUBE operations

Cochrane et al. teaches with one or more GROUPING SETS, ROLLUP or CUBE operations (see column 7, lines 26-30, and column 7, lines 44-48)

Cheng et al. as modified teaches:

in its original form, instead of rewriting the GROUP BY clause, until after the query rewrite (see Cheng et al. Page 1, Example 1, and Page 5, query 1. In Q'1, the group by clause has been retained); and

(b) at a later stage of query compilation, translating the GROUP BY clause with the GROUPING SETS, ROLLUP or CUBE operations into a plurality of levels, wherein each of the levels has one or more grouping sets (see 8:26-42, Figure 7. This step occurs after the step listed above) comprised of grouping columns (see 11:62-12:15).

The GROUP BY sets are comprised of columns a, b, x, and y)

Cheng et al. as modified does not teach generating a query execution plan for the query with a super group block having an array of pointers, wherein each pointer points to the grouping sets for a particular one of the level

Al-omari et al. teaches generating a query execution plan for the query with a super group block having an array of pointers, wherein each pointer points to the grouping sets for a particular one of the level (see Figure 3D, 'link mode to GROUP').  
Also see 10:36-48, 14:28-35, 41-43)

Cheng et al. as modified teaches:

(c) performing the query execution plan to retrieve data from a database stored on the computer system (see Cochrane et al. 7:41-43).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Cheng et al. by the teachings of Cochrane et al., since Cochrane et al. teaches that "a method for detecting and stacking grouping sets to support group by operations with grouping sets, rollup, and cube extensions in relational database management systems, with greatly reduced numbers of grouping sets" (see Abstract).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Cheng et al. by the teachings of Al-omari et al., since Al-omari et al. teaches "a system and method for optimizing complex SQL database queries" (see 3:18-19).

As to claim 8, see the rejection in regards to claim 2 above.

As to claim 9, see the rejection in regards to claim 3 above.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 4, and 7 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant argues that "with regard to the limitation "at a later stage of query compilation, translating the GROUP BY clause with the GROUPING SETS, ROLLUP, or CUBE operations into a plurality of levels, wherein each of the levels has one or more grouping sets comprised of grouping columns", these limitations are not shown in Cochrane et al. 8:26-42 and 11:62-12:15", it is noted that Figure 7 shows constructing a query graph model of multiple levels, wherein each level is comprised of grouping sets comprised of grouping columns.

***Conclusion***

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles D. Adams whose telephone number is (571) 272-3938. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM, M - F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571) 272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Charles Adams  
AU2164

cu

*Charles Rones*  
CHARLES RONES  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER